REMARKS

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal et al ("Agrawal"), U.S. Patent No. 6,324, 533 and Martin, U.S. Patent No. 6,704,743. Claims 25-31 and 32-38 where rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-9 in in view of Agrawal and Martin. Claims 1-9, 25-31 and 32-38.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On December 18, 2007, Examiner Jean Corrielus and Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, participated in a telephonic interview. During the interview, Mr. Eiferman proposed the claim amendments herein. Examiner Corrielus agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the claim amendments and remarks herein.

RECJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal in view of Martin. Claims 25-31 and 32-38 where rejected under the same rationale as claims 1-9 in in view of Agrawal and Martin.

Independent claims 1, 25 and 32 have been amended to further clarify the claimed invention. Although applicant's representative does not agree that "Applicant admitted that at least one limitation and not all limitations (referring to the recited Item, Element and Relationship in the claims) were needed in order for the claimed limitations to be realized," given that the claims were not set up in a "Markush claim structure", and thus all recited elements should have been interpreted as being part of the claim, the claims have been amended in order to further clarify the fact that all of the recited elements (Item, Element and Relationship) are part of the claim.

Independent claims 1, 25 and 32 have been further amended to recite in part:

"a *plurality of* Relationship*s comprising containment Relationships and reference Relationships, wherein the containment Relationships control the life-time of the Item and are further classified as a holding Relationship or an embedding Relationship, and wherein the Item is deleted when the holding relationship is deleted*," and

"a Base Schema that establishes a framework for creating and organizing each Item *and setting the foundational set of properties that the Item may possess*".

Neither the Agrawal or the Martin references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest an Item that includes an Element and a plurality of Relationships as currently recited in independent claims 1, 25 and 32. Agrawal is directed to mining data relationships from an integrated database and, as mentioned in the office action, it does not teach a base schema and a core schema as schema as recited. Agrawal further fails to teach or suggest an Item that includes an Element and a plurality of Relationships as currently recited in all of the claims. The Martin reference which is directed to an object oriented environment providing selective inheritance of object parameters also fails to teach or suggest an Item that includes an Element and a plurality of Relationships as recited in independent claims 1, 25 and 32. As such, claims 1, 25 and 32 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-9, 26-31 and 33-38 which add further nonobvious features to their corresponding independent claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: January 3, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439